



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/648,595	08/25/2003	Richard Harvey	063170.6609	4259
5073 7590 08/24/2009 BAKER BOTTS L.L.P. 2001 ROSS AVENUE SUITE 600 DALLAS, TX 75201-2980				
EXAMINER				
LEWIS, ALICIA M				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2164				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/24/2009		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ptomail1@bakerbotts.com

glenda.orrantia@bakerbotts.com



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/648,595
Filing Date: August 25, 2003
Appellant(s): HARVEY ET AL.

Jenni Moen (Reg. No. 52,038)
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed December 2, 2008 appealing from the Office action mailed May 16, 2008.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

No amendment after final has been filed.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is substantially correct. The changes are as follows: Although claims 18 and 20 depend from claims 1 and 8, respectively, claims 18 and 20 are rejected as being unpatentable over Elmore in view of Gadbois and Moran, and further in view of Grubbs.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

US 2006/0059107 A1	Elmore et al.	3-2006
US 2004/0002955 A1	Gadbois et al.	1-2004
US 2008/0109897 A1	Moran et al.	5-2008
US 2003/0236956 A1	Grubbs et al.	12-2003

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) (*current application filing date 8/26/2002*) as being unpatentable over Elmore et al (US 2006/0059107 A1, *priority date 3/30/2001*) in view of Gadbois et al. (US Patent Application Publication

2004/0002955 A1, *filing date 6/28/2002*) ('Gadbois'), and further in view of Moran et al (US 2008/0109897 A1, *priority date 7/12/2001*) ('Moran').

With respect to claims 1 and 8, Elmore teaches:

arranging user object(s) under a repository layer comprising one or more repository objects collectively forming a prefix, each user object representing a web services account (elements 462 and 463 in Figure 19, paragraph 626; and element 491 and 492 in Figure 21, paragraph 976-978);

arranging business entity object(s) under user object(s) (elements 467 and 468 in Figure 19, paragraph 626; and element 493 in Figure 21, paragraph 976); and

receiving a request to modify an object from a user (Figure 9, paragraphs 194, 195 and 518).

Elmore does not teach arranging corresponding tModel object(s) under at least one of user object(s), repository object and prefix.

Gadbois teaches information model mapping with shared directory tree representations (see abstract), in which he teaches arranging corresponding tModel object(s) under at least one of user object(s), repository object and prefix (paragraph 39).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Elmore by the teaching of Gadbois because arranging corresponding tModel object(s) under at least one of user object(s), repository object and prefix would enable an efficient means of recording and publishing

assertions regarding business organization relationships (peer-to-peer, parent-subsidiary, etc.) by different business organizations or their authorized publishing entities and an efficient means of managing publisher assertions (Gadbois, paragraph 4).

Further regarding claims 1 and 8, Elmore in view of Gadbois does not teach matching a distinguished name associated with the user and at least a portion of the distinguished name associated with the object; providing the user access to the object in response to matching the distinguished name associated with the object and the distinguished name associated with the user; and modifying the object as requested by the user in response to the user accessing the object.

Moran teaches grouped access control list actions (see abstract), in which he teaches:

receiving a request to modify an object from a user (paragraph 46);

matching a distinguished name associated with the user and at least a portion of the distinguished name associated with the object (paragraph 115);

providing the user access to the object in response to matching the distinguished name associated with the object and the distinguished name associated with the user (paragraph 115); and

modifying the object as requested by the user in response to the user accessing the object (paragraphs 46 and 115).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified Elmore by the teaching of Moran because matching a distinguished name associated with the user and at least a portion of the distinguished name associated with the object; providing the user access to the object in response to matching the distinguished name associated with the object and the distinguished name associated with the user; and modifying the object as requested by the user in response to the user accessing the object would enable the use of access control lists to describe permissions on protected systems and networks to access resources and objects associated with clients, thus providing a more secure, protected system.

With respect to claims 2 and 9, Elmore as modified teaches arranging publisher assertion object(s) under business entity object(s) (Gadbois, elements 222, 224, 252, 254, 282 and 284 in Figure 2, paragraphs 28-29).

With respect to claims 3 and 10, Elmore as modified teaches further comprising providing service projection object(s) under business entity object(s) (Gadbois, elements 222, 224, 242, 243, 244, 272 and 274 in Figure 2, paragraph 28).

With respect to claims 4 and 11, Elmore as modified teaches wherein the service projection object(s) is implemented as an alias (Gadbois, elements 242, 243, 244, 245 and 246 in Figure 2, paragraphs 28 and 29).

With respect to claims 5 and 12, Elmore as modified teaches further comprising first field(s) as attributes of publisher assertion object(s) (Gadbois, elements 254 and 284 in Figure 2, paragraph 33).

Gadbois teaches that publisher assertion names (PublisherAssertion1 and PublisherAssertion2) and publisher names (Publisher1 and Publisher2) are attributes of publisher assertion object(s).

With respect to claims 6 and 13, Elmore as modified teaches further comprising representing a keyed reference by an auxiliary class (Gadbois, paragraphs 38-39).

Gadbois discloses that a fromKey, toKey, and keyedReference are all included when publisher assertions are added to a directory information tree (DIT). One having ordinary skill in the art recognizes that these included attributes represent an auxiliary class because they are added to publisher assertion objects instances rather than to the entire class of objects.

With respect to claims 7 and 14, Elmore as modified teaches further comprising providing a distinguished name of an object revealing a chain of ownership and control for the object (Gadbois, Figure 2, paragraphs 27-29).

With respect to claims 15 and 16, Elmore as modified teaches storing the arrangement of user objects, one or more repository objects, business entity objects,

and tmodel objects in a registry accessible to one or more users of web services (Gadbois, paragraphs 23-25).

With respect to claims 17 and 19, Elmore as modified teaches:

providing a plurality of repository layers distributed on a plurality of servers, each repository layer comprising at least one repository object (Elmore, paragraphs 46 and 978); and

assigning a domain name to each of the plurality of repository layers (Elmore, paragraphs 972 and 973);

wherein arranging user object(s) under a repository layer comprises arranging user object(s) under each of the repository objects (Elmore, paragraph 978).

Claims 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elmore et al (US 2006/0059107 A1) in view of Gadbois et al. (US Patent Application Publication 2004/0002955 A1) ('Gadbois') and Moran et al (US 2008/0109897 A1, priority date 7/12/2001) ('Moran'), as applied to claims 1-17 and 19 above, and further in view of Grubbs et al. (US 2003/0236956 A1) ('Grubbs').

With respect to claims 18 and 20, Elmore as modified teaches:

providing a plurality of repository layers distributed on a plurality of servers, each repository layer comprising at least one repository object (Elmore, paragraph 46); and

the arrangements of user objects, business entities and tmodel objects on a server.

Elmore as modified does not teach logically representing each entry on each server, each entry only stored on a selected one of the plurality of servers.

Grubbs teaches file system backup in a logical volume management data storage environment (see abstract), in which he teaches logically representing each entry on each server, each entry only stored on a selected one of the plurality of servers (paragraphs 24-26).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified Elmore by the teaching of Grubbs because logically representing each entry on each server, each entry only stored on a selected one of the plurality of servers would enable capturing a valid point-in-time image of a system using logical volume management, which could further be used for archiving and back-ups (Grubbs, abstract).

(10) Response to Argument

Claims 1-6, 8-13 and 15-20 – Elmore-Gadbois-Moran Combination

Applicant argues that the proposed Elmore-Gadbois-Moran combination does not teach matching a distinguished name associated with the user and at least a portion of the distinguished name associated with the object. The Examiner disagrees. Moran teaches that in response to a request to access an object, a user ID from authenticated credentials is matched against the object's ACL entries (steps 91 and 92 in Figure 9,

paragraph 115). He further teaches that an ACL entry for an object includes a type and identifier, i.e. a unique identifier or name of an entity (Figure 8, paragraphs 63 and 71-75). Thus the user ID from the authenticated credential may be considered a distinguished name associated with the user, and this user ID is matched against an ACL entry for the object, which contains a type (i.e. user) and identifier of the type (i.e. ID of the user). Thus it is clear that Moran teaches that a name associated with a user (user ID) is matched with at least a portion of the name associated with the object. The objects, such as system files, have ACL entries associated with them, and the ACL entries include unique identifiers (user IDs) of who has what permissions to access/modify the object (file). Thus, the unique identifier (distinguished name) of an ACL entry is associated with the object (system file), and is matches against the user ID presented in the authenticated credentials. Thus, a distinguished name associated with the user (user ID) is matched with at least a portion of the distinguished name associated with the object (i.e. the unique identifier or name of the entity).

Applicant further argues that the combination fails to teach providing the user access to the object in response to matching the distinguished name associated with the object and the distinguished name associated with the user. Examiner disagrees. Moran teaches matching the distinguished name associated with the object and the distinguished name associated with the user as explained above with respect to steps 91 and 92 in Figure 9 and paragraph 115. Moran further teaches that in response to a match between the user ID of the credentials and the ACL entry (which includes an identifier of the user, paragraphs 63 and 74-75), the user is granted the specific access

permissions to the object (step 93 in Figure 9, paragraph 115). Thus, the combination does teach providing the user access to the object in response to matching the distinguished name associated with the object and the distinguished name associated with the user.

Applicant argues that the Elmore-Gadbois-Moran combination is improper because one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would not have been motivated to modify or combine the cited references. Examiner disagrees. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the motivation was found in the references.

The primary reference Elmore is directed to a comprehensive electronic business support system for supporting communication services. Gadbois teaches a registry service, in which businesses may register, that provides information regarding business organizations. Thus it would have been obvious to combine the two references to enable Elmore's electronic business support system an efficient means of recording and publishing assertions regarding business organization relationships (peer-to-peer, parent-subsidiary, etc.) by different business organizations or their authorized publishing

entities and an efficient means of managing publisher assertions (Gadbois, paragraph 4). Further, Moran teaches grouped access control lists to describe permitted actions on protected system resources or objects. Thus it would have been obvious to further modify Elmore by the teachings of Moran to enable the use of access control lists to describe permissions on Elmore's systems and networks to access particular resources and objects associated with clients, thus providing the ability to associate separate permissions to individual resources and objects, and thus provide a more secure, protected system (Moran, abstract).

Claims 7 and 14 – Elmore-Gadbois-Moran Combination

Applicant argues that the Elmore-Gadbois-Moran combination does not teach providing a distinguished name of an object revealing a chain of ownership and control for the object. Examiner disagrees. Gadbois teaches a directory information tree (Figure 2) showing a chain of ownership and control for objects. For example, Organization1 node provides a distinguished name of an object (Organization1), and the interior sub-nodes which contain further links or information regarding the respective organization reveal a chain of ownership and control for the object (Organization1) (Gadbois, paragraphs 27-28). Thus, the Elmore-Gadbois-Moran combination teaches a distinguished name of an object revealing a chain of ownership and control for the object.

Regarding claims 7 and 14, Applicant again argues that the Elmore-Gadbois-Moran combination is improper. As explained above, the Examiner disagrees. Please see the remarks above regarding the Elmore-Gadbois-Moran combination.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

/A. M. L./
Examiner, Art Unit 2164
March 4, 2009

Conferees:

/James Trujillo/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2169

/Charles Rones/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2164